DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 684 EC 305 730

AUTHOR Jorgensen, Cheryl M.; And Others
TITLE Curriculum and Its Impact on Inclusion and the Achievement of Students with Disabilities.
INSTITUTION Allegheny-Singer Research Inst., Pittsburgh, PA.
SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE JUL 97
NOTE 21p.
CONTRACT 86V-40007
AVAILABLE FROM Child and Family Studies Program, Allegheny University of the Health Sciences, One Allegheny Center, Suite 501, Pittsburgh, PA 15212; telephone: 412-359-1654; fax: 412-359-1601.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT CISP Issue Brief; v2 n2 Jul 1997
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; *Curriculum Development; *Disabilities; *Educational Change; High Schools; *Inclusive Schools; Individual Differences; Individualized Instruction; Instructional Development; Mainstreaming; Social Studies; State Standards; Units of Study
IDENTIFIERS *Coalition of Essential Schools; Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

This report analyzes how curriculum, especially current standards-based reform efforts relating to curriculum, are impacting students with disabilities in inclusive settings. Curriculum is defined as both the content and methods a teacher uses to plan and conduct a class. The issue brief contrasts two different high school social studies programs to illustrate the use of either a differentiated curriculum for different types of students in different classes or a single, but broadened, curriculum designed to work with a wide range of students. It notes the approach developed by the Coalition of Essential Schools, which has identified "Essential Questions" that all students can address in various ways. Typical learning experiences of students under this approach are summarized, from the gifted level to those with severe disabilities. Beliefs that foster inclusive curriculum are identified and the following eight curricular elements that challenge and support all students are discussed: (1) a central unit, problem, or question; (2) a unit "grabber" or kick-off activity; (3) learning experiences that link; (4) richly detailed source material; (5) varied learning formats; (6) multiple assessments; (7) various modes of expression; and (8) culminating projects. The report concludes with suggested district level or state level questions when developing curriculum standards to maximize access and achievement for all students. (Contains 12 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Policy Research
ISSUE BRIEF
Practice

ED 409 684

Volume 2, Number 2 July 1997

Consortium on Inclusive Schooling Practices

Curriculum and Its Impact on Inclusion and the Achievement of Students with Disabilities

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Cheryl M. Jorgensen
with contributions by
Douglas Fisher and Virginia Roach

In 1996, the National Consortium on Inclusive Schooling Practices developed a framework to analyze state and local policies and their effects on school inclusion (CISP, 1996). This framework corresponds with the prevailing reform paradigm in most states by focusing on **standards-based systemic reform** across six major policy areas: curriculum, student assessment, accountability, personnel development and professional training, finance, and governance. The present issue brief extends the discussion on one of these policy areas, namely curriculum. Curriculum has been described in many ways. Some people talk of curriculum as the content that is covered in a specific class. Others maintain that curriculum is the instructional strategies that teachers use. We use the term curriculum to describe a *course of study*. In other words, we view curriculum as both the content and methods a teacher uses to plan and conduct his or her class.

The Impact of Standards-Based Reform on Students with Disabilities

What is the impact of the standards-based reform initiative on students with disabilities? Intuitively, many people think that increasing educational standards ought to benefit all students. As it concerns students with disabilities, parents and educators have long believed that raising expectations results in higher achievement. Educators often imagine that if our local school officials want to increase the percentage of students who score in the "proficient" or "mastery" categories on state assessments, they will want to increase all students' access to rigorous academic classes and effective teachers. We are encouraged by the thought that adopting higher expectations for students would lead to the dissolution of low-track special education classes such as "Applied English," "Everyday Math," and "Basic Science." Perhaps even greater numbers of students with disabilities might be enrolled in college preparatory classes, thus broadening their career options and their potential earning power as adults.

EC 305 730

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Furthermore, educators understand that adopting high standards for all students should promote the elimination of tracking and the inclusion of students with disabilities more fully in the mainstream of general education based on common learning standards for all students.[1] In the context of standards-based reform, the curriculum is viewed as a unifying vehicle to ensure that a variety of students "master" the same information.

The Relationships Between State Standards, Curriculum Frameworks, and Local Practice

The national effort to improve the educational achievement of America's school children is grounded in the establishment of rigorous learning standards at every level of elementary and secondary education. In developing a standards-based system, policymakers hope to refocus teaching and learning on a common understanding of what communities expect students to know and be able to do as a result of their public school experience. Once established, the standards provide the foundation for curriculum development -- or in the current parlance -- designing curriculum frameworks. Curriculum frameworks are outlines that establish benchmarks for curriculum content at the various grade levels, thus providing the broad context from which districts then develop their specific curricula.* In some states these frameworks merely provide voluntary guidance to local districts as they develop their curriculum. In other states, the frameworks provide the foundation for new statewide assessment systems, as well as guidance for textbook approval, curriculum priorities, and instructional strategies.

* For a further discussion of standards and curriculum frameworks, see *What Will It Take? Standards-Based Education for All Students*, National Association of State Boards of Education, 1996.

There is, unfortunately, another less positive scenario for describing the impact of standards-based reform on students with disabilities. What if states develop learning standards that do not reflect the needs of students with disabilities or others who traditionally have been only marginally included in the educational system? What if different standards are developed for different kinds of students -- honors expectations for honors students, special education expectations for special education students, etc? If students with disabilities are not considered in the development of general standards or the design of curriculum frameworks, or if their test scores are not included in an aggregate district score, an even more segregated system of education might evolve. It is possible that schools would do more tracking and students with disabilities would have less access to high-level curriculum than they do now. Fewer students with disabilities might qualify for a "real" high school diploma, and their future educational and career choices would continue to be limited.

Achieving High Standards in Inclusive Classrooms

The situations at two New England high schools, close in proximity but far apart in terms of educational practice, illustrate the contrast between using a differentiated curriculum for different types of students

[1] As defined in *Winners All: A Call for Inclusive Schools* (NASBE, 1992), inclusion means that students receiving special education--to the maximum extent possible--recieve their in-school educational services in the general education classroom with appropriate in-class support. Included students attend their home school with their age and grade peers. In inclusive districts, the proportion of students labeled for special services is relatively uniform for all the schools within the district, and that ratio reflects the proportion of people with disabilities in society at large.

and using a single, but broadened curriculum that is designed to work with a wide range of students.

In the first case, a large, public high school in southern New Hampshire, five levels of 9th grade social studies are used: honors, college prep, general, basic, and special education. These levels are more than implicit -- they are used as the actual course titles. The curriculum in each of these classes -- what teachers teach, what students are expected to know, and the means through which it is taught -- differs greatly. In addition to these levels of social studies, some students with the most severe cognitive disabilities do not enroll in any social studies classes.

The students in the **college prep** and **general tracks** do most of their learning from a textbook. Each night they are required to read a section of a chapter and answer several summary questions. In class the following day, they discuss the previous night's reading and review the homework questions. Then the teacher lectures for part of the period (essentially going over what the students will read for homework that night). If there is time, students begin their homework. At the end of the chapter, they take a test that usually consists of multiple choice, matching, fill-in-the-blank, and/or short essay questions.

Students in the **honors** classes also use a textbook, but the teacher supplements it with primary sources. The students write essays more frequently and complete portions of previous SAT or Advanced Placement tests for the end-of-unit evaluation.

Students in the **basic** class, who study citizenship and current events, would typically be found in an "LD Resource" class in a traditional school. They learn about the Constitution, the law-making process, and the importance of exercising their right to vote. Their teacher uses a variety of teaching styles, including cooperative group work, hands-on projects, field trips to the state capital, and in-class presentations by local and state politicians. The teacher has the students read a regional or local newspaper and discuss current national and international events. While the learning experiences are rich and varied, the students are not held accountable for demonstrating that they actually have acquired any new knowledge or are able to apply it to their own lives.

Students in the **special education** class -- who represent those labels of mental retardation and significant learning disabilities -- learn "functional life skills" relating to accessing transportation, managing money, and using such public facilities as the library.

Students in this school who have disabilities and who complete the state required course work receive a regular high school diploma, unless their IEPs dictate modified expectations from the regular curriculum. In other words, as long as accommodations are only in such areas as seating preference, use of calculators, and extended time for assignments or test taking, and not in the standards themselves, *these students are considered to have achieved the same learning standards as students without disabilities.*

In contrast to this example, the social studies curriculum is organized very differently at another high school located not twenty miles from the first. This school is a member of the Coalition of Essential Schools, a network of high schools working to redesign their overall structure, curriculum, and assessment procedures to improve student learning and achievement.

All students at this school enroll in heterogeneous, non-tracked social studies classes. Tenth grade social studies is the same for all students. No special classes or rooms exist just for students with disabilities. The impact of this school organization approach is significant. As one social studies teacher reports,

> I was very nervous at first about having all students [including students with significant disabilities] in my room. How could I pick material that they all could understand and connect with? I've found out that creating questions that all students can answer is the key. When I did a unit on slavery and the Civil War, we used the question, "What does it mean to be free?" Some students in my class could answer that question using information from their Civil War reading and by thinking about the progress of civil rights in the U.S. One or two students in my class had to approach this question first from their own personal perspective. "Amro" (a student with significant disabilities) knows that he is treated differently from his brothers, and he has a strong opinion about that. If we start with his personal experience, it's a little bit easier for him to make a connection with the Civil War.

At this high school, creative teaching allows students with and without disabilities to be taught according to the same standards, while bringing different perspectives to the classroom discussion.

The "question" that enabled this teacher to connect with all of her students ("What does it mean to be free?") is an example of "Essential Questions" developed by the Coalition of Essential Schools (Sizer, 1992). Such questions are used in a curriculum design process characterized by "planning backwards" from outcomes and the final "exhibition" of learning to the details of curriculum design. Some characteristics of "Essential Questions" are: a) there is no one right answer; b) the questions are intended to help students become investigators; c) the questions involve thinking -- not just answering; d) the questions offer a sense of adventure, are fun to explore, and try to answer; e) the questions imply that all students can answer them; and f) the questions require students to connect different disciplines and areas of knowledge.

This orientation promotes the developement of a unified curriculum in which teachers use a variety of materials and instructional grouping that allow different demonstrations and personalized outcomes within the broad question being studied. Throughout the Civil War unit, the teacher cited above had students read and listen to first-person accounts of slaves, slave owners, soldiers, politicians, and everday citizens who lived through that era. The teacher attempted to simulate some of the conditions of a slave ship and give each student a glimpse into the inhumane way that Africans were treated during their voyage to America. Students watched videotapes of speeches by Martin Luther King, Jr. and read contemporary newspaper editorials that reflected public sentiment. The teacher required every student to answer the "Essential Question" first for themselves (e.g., what does it mean to you to 'be free'?) and then to reflect on the same question from the perspective of Americans from other eras.

What are the outcomes for students and how did they demonstrate what they had learned? "Esther" and "Brian," two students

who would have been in honors classes in a traditional school, learned much more than a set of facts about people, places, dates, and events connected with the Civil War. They had to analyze and synthesize what they learned about the war from a variety of perspectives that diverse people (slaves, slave owners, Northerners, Southerners) can have about the same concept -- freedom. They then wrote a paper that used historical facts to support their analysis. In addition, they staged a debate, taking the roles and arguing from the points of view of slaves, slave owners, and politicians.

For the first time in his life, "Amro" learned about the Civil War. He learned that some people have different colored skin than others and that a long time ago, those people were kept as slaves. He gained an understanding of what their lives were like by comparing their loss of freedom to some of his own experiences as a student with disabilities who also had been segregated in a special education class and who still does not have the freedoms that most other students have. "Amro" designed a collage showing that he understood how people all over the world may look very different from one another, but that all have the right to and desire for freedom.

For his final exhibition, "Brandon" (a student who had significant communication, behavioral, and physical challenges) wrote a letter to a student thirty years in the future. He reflected on the progress that had been made in full participation and opportunity for people with disabilities. He talked about his own frustrations and the efforts that schools in the 1990s were making to include all students.

At the Coalition school, students with disabilities have specified in their IEPs the criteria for graduation and receipt of a high school diploma. Currently, the diplomas of students who need significant modifications are marked with an asterisk. College admissions officers and/or prospective employers are urged to contact the school if they want information on the proficiencies that a particular student attained in his or her modified general education classes. Both schools attempt to include students with disabilities, but the means and results are very different. The first school has developed a distinct curriculum for each of its five tracks, and once those tracks are established the curriculum in each is fairly set or static. In contrast, the second school has established one basic curriculum that is then broadened to meet the needs of individual students. This school, by virtue of how they construct their curriculum, is more inclusive.

Beliefs About Students and Learning

Clearly, the teacher referred to above and other teachers share a number of beliefs about students and learning that form the foundation from which a curriculum is developed. These beliefs (Onosko & Jorgensen, in press) include:

1. All students can think and learn.
2. All students have value and unique gifts to offer their school.
3. Diversity within a school community should be embraced and celebrated.
4. All students differ in the ways they most effectively learn and express their understandings.
5. All students learn best when they are actively and collaboratively building knowledge with their classmates and their teacher.
6. All students learn best when studying interesting and challenging topics that they find personally meaningful.
7. Effective teaching for students with disabilities is substantively the same as

effective teaching for all students.

Characteristics of Curriculum and Instruction

Teachers' success in developing effective, inclusive learning experiences for all students emanates from their beliefs and philosophy about teaching and learning, from the curriculum content guidelines adopted by their state and school district, and from their utilization of a particular set of unit and lesson design principles.

Determining what and how to teach all students -- the content of "the curriculum" -- requires that we examine more than just the body of knowledge that currently exists in particular academic disciplines. All students, including those with disabilities, need to learn three "types" of skills: (1) dispositions and habits of mind (such as inquisitiveness, diligence, collaboration, work habits, tolerance, and critical thinking); (2) content area knowledge (in science, social studies, language arts, computers, the arts, etc.); and (3) basic academic skills such as reading, writing, and mathematics (Sizer, 1992; U.S. Department of Labor, 1991).

Educators concerned primarily with teaching students with disabilities might wish that all schools would develop their curriculum -- the content of what they teach -- to address all three of these skill areas. If they did, it would be possible for any school to address any student's priority learning goals. No school would be "too academic," "too vocational," or "too devoted to the basics" for students with disabilities. And this could be accomplished by setting high standards for all.

It is inevitable, however, that schools will express the preferences of their local community and their teachers by adopting a particular "curriculum personality." This may reflect a variety of factors: membership in a national organization such as the Coalition of Essential Schools or Howard Gardner's Project Zero (a group of research projects whose common goal is to develop new approaches to learning for the individual, group, and institution); district funding to adopt a specific set of practices (e.g., School-to-Work opportunities); district curriculum policy influenced by strong political or religious viewpoints (e.g., banning outcomes-based education or adopting creation science); or teachers falling on one side or the other of various pedagogical debates (e.g., the "constructivist" approach that defines the student as an active learner who literally constructs meaning from the learning experience versus "direct instruction" that relies heavily on teacher-directed activities) (Gardner, 1983; Johnson & Johnson, 1991; Poplin & Stone, 1992; School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994; Sizer, 1992; Tarver, 1992).

Considering this inevitable variability in "curriculum personality" from district to district and school to school, we recommend that all teachers use some common curriculur elements to design teaching/learning experiences that transcend philosophical differences and that result in a learning environment that challenges and supports *all* students. Onosko and Jorgensen (in press) have identified eight such curricular elements (see also the work of M. Hunter, 1971). A brief definition of each follows.

Element #1: A Central Unit Issue, Problem, or Question

Structuring a unit of study around an issue, problem, or essential question creates a

framework for the learning experience and provides direction and coherence (Onosko & Jorgensen, in press). In a standards-based curriculum, these "central unit" issues are generated by teachers with the standards firmly in mind. In the Civil War lesson described above, the unit issue is "Can you be free, if you are not treated equally?" In this unit, students can demonstrate their mastery of several content standards, depending on the particular activities and products the teacher has planned. For example, students can illustrate that they understand the concepts of continuity and change in the history of the United States, as well as principles and processes of government systems. They also should be able to comprehend and assess the content and artistic aspects of oral and visual presentations.[2]

When all students in a classroom are focused on addressing a common question, differences in learning style and ability are less important than the commonality of all students constructing meaning in the content area, albeit in a personalized way. Well-crafted "essential questions" or problems offer challenge and accessability to all students.

Element #2: Unit "Grabber"

Beginning each major unit of study with a highly motivating "grabber" or kick-off activity can help engage all students. Inclusive classrooms are comprised of a variety of students, including those who already know a good deal of the subject matter and can express their knowledge well; students who know a lot but have a difficult time showing it; students who have no prior experience with or knowledge about the topic at hand; and students who are more interested in alternative rock music than in cell structure. A first-day activity that proposes a provocative question to students (e.g., "If we can clone sheep, should we?") or asks them to state an opinion about a dilemma that has personal meaning in their lives (e.g., "What is worth fighting for?") is another element of effective, inclusive curriculum design.

Element #3: Learning Experiences that Link

All students need to have explicit connections made among individual daily learning experiences. Teachers must assure that daily activities logically build students' knowledge throughout the unit to enable them to use the body of newly acquired knowledge to answer the overarching unit question. For example, three activities that might accomplish this goal are: (1) identifying various viewpoints or positions regarding the unit's central issue or problem; (2) identifying key concepts, events, or persons related to the issue under consideration; and (3) identifying and answering questions that need to be considered to intelligently address the problem or issue.

Element #4: Richly Detailed Source Material

The use of richly detailed source material that represents a variety of student learning styles and intelligences assures that each student in the class has access to the knowledge base in the topic being studied. Too often teachers put students with reading difficulties at a distinct disadvantage from the start by failing to augment print-based information sources. "Accommodations" such as books on tape, commercially available summaries of literary works, or being read to by another

[2]Example standards taken from "The Show-Me Standards," Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, March, 1996.

student or teacher are inferior options, in most cases. Most students would better understand a lecture on DNA if the teacher included an activity that has the students take apart and put together a three-dimensional model of the complex double-helix molecule. This was in fact the method used in a genetics unit at the Coalition high school, where the science teacher had students build their own construction paper model of the DNA molecule after reading about DNA, watching a NOVA special on heredity, and putting together a plastic model.

Element #5: Varied Learning Formats

When teachers use a variety of teaching formats, such as cooperative groups, whole class instruction, student pairs, Socratic dialogues, labs, and teacher-student conferencing, the probability increases that each student's learning style will be addressed. Varying the instructional format lessens boredom and predictability and gives teachers more opportunities to get "up close and personal" with each student to assess progress, to analyze the difficulties he or she is having with the materials, to correct mistakes and misunderstandings, and ultimately to adjust future teaching and learning experiences based on that feedback.

Element #6: Multiple Assessments

To ensure powerful student learning, teachers need to monitor and assess students' progress throughout the unit, not just at the end. The greater diversity found in the inclusive classroom makes the need for periodic assessment all the more critical. For this reason, multiple assessments are important elements of inclusive unit design.

Element #7: Varied Modes of Expression

Intelligence is comprised of many different kinds of abilities and talents. While teachers traditionally tend to emphasize verbal-linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligences to the exclusion of most other talents, teachers in inclusive classrooms need to design instructional and assessment activities that "tap into" the variety of intelligences. For example, in a unit on inventions that utilizes all of the students' intelligences, musically inclined students study the science behind the invention of electronic music; "spatially smart" students build or draw a new invention; and students with strong linguistic and interpersonal intelligence form a discussion group to write a "policy brief" supporting or challenging government funding for cloning experiments (Armstrong, 1994).

Element #8: Culminating Projects

Culminating projects provide students with opportunities to demonstrate their understanding of the unit's central issue or problem through a public presentation. When teachers provide choices for how students can present their final exhibition, including options for written papers, demonstrations, oral presentations, and building models, each student has the opportunity to use his or her favored learning style.

District Level Questions

Based on the above beliefs about students and learning and the elements of effective and inclusive curriculum, educators and members of local communities need to analyze their own curriculum and instructional methods relative to both the achievement of all

students (excellence) and the degree to which all students have access to the general curriculum and program (equity). Table 1 depicts a set of four guiding questions that might frame this inquiry, with examples of responses from two actual and very different districts.

State Level Questions

State policymakers, including legislators, department of education administrators, and state boards of education members need to analyze their state standards, curriculum frameworks, and assessments using the criteria of access and achievement for all students, including those with disabilities. Table 2 presents guiding questions for states and sample responses from the author's home state.

* * * * * * *

In summary, since teaching is both a science and an art, evaluating student learning, designing curriculum, and teaching are difficult, to say the least. Hopefully, the issues noted above are a starting point for states and districts concerned with evaluating the extent to which their policies support the inclusion and achievement of students with disabilities in the context of a new standards-based curriculum.

References

Armstrong, T. (1994). *Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Comer, J. (Ed.). (1996). *Rallying the Whole Village: The Comer Process for Reforming Education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences.* New York: Basic Books.

Hunter, M. (1971). *Teach for Transfer: A Programed Book.* El Segundo, CA: TIP Publications.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1991). *Learning Together and Alone* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Onosko, J., & Jorgensen, C. (in press). "Unit and lesson planning in the inclusive classroom: Maximizing learning opportunities for all students." In C. Jorgensen, *Restructuring High Schools to Include All Students: Taking Inclusion to the Next Level.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Poplin, M., & Stone, S. (1992). "Paradigm shifts in instructional strategies: From reductionism to holistic/constructivism." In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), *Controversial Issues Confronting Special Education* (pp. 153-182). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Posner, G. (1995). *Analyzing the Curriculum* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994. (P.L. 103-239).

Sizer, T. (1992). *Horace's School. Redesigning the American High School.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Tarver, S. (1992). "Direct instruction." In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), *Controversial Issues Confronting Special Education* (pp. 141-152). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

U.S. Department of Labor (1991). *What Work Requires of Schools: A SCANS Report for America 2000.* VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Table 1. Guiding questions and sample district responses regarding curriculum and students with disabilities.

GUIDING QUESTIONS	DISTRICT A	DISTRICT B
Are parents and other community members aware of the curriculum and are they actively involved in the development and review of the district's curriculum?	Each year a different curriculum area is reviewed by this district. Parents and members of the business community participate on curriculum review teams. Copies of each subject area curriculum are available in the office of each school in the district and in the local public library.	Curriculum is reviewed in this district on an infrequent, irreguluar schedule. No parents or community members are involved in reviewing curriculum (with the exception of business community members who are involved in the Tech-Prep program at the school's regional vocational center). Parents who request copies of the curriculum from the district curriculum coordinator must attend a meeting with him before they are allowed to view it.

07/22/97 11:38 FAX 412 359 1601 ASRI CFS 011

Table 1(cont.).

GUIDING QUESTIONS	DISTRICT A	DISTRICT B
What is the approved curriculum in the district? Does the district develop/provide model curricula or examples of curriculum adaptations that could be used with students with significant disabilities or any student characteristics?	The approved curriculum from the district was developed using a number of source materials. The state curriculum frameworks, on which the statewide assessment tests are based, was used as a starting point. In addition, each academic discipline used its own professional organization's guidelines (National Council of Teachers of English, National Association for the Education of Young Children, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, etc.) to enrich the state curriculum. Finally, this district used work by Robert Marzano to develop student learning outcomes using language such as "student as information synthesizer," "student as cooperative learner," "student as communicator," and so forth. Modifications to the curriculum for students with disabilities are designed on a student-by-student basis and become part of the student's IEP. There are no district-developed guidelines or examples.	The district does not have a "district curriculum" per se. Each academic discipline -- the language arts, social studies, science, foreign languages, vocational education -- produces its own curriculum guidelines, each using a different presentation format.

07/22/97 11:38 FAX 412 359 1601 ASRI CFS 012

Table 1(cont.).

GUIDING QUESTIONS	DISTRICT A	DISTRICT B
Do all students have the opportunity to access the core curriculum in a manner that takes into consideration their individual disabilities and learning styles? What processes and provisions are available for adapting or modifying the curriculum to meet the needs of a variety of students?	All students in this district are enrolled in heterogeneous, non-tracked general education classes. Student planning teams, consisting of general education and special education teachers, plan curriculum and determine supports and modifications needed by any student, not just those with disabilities. These teams meet every day during a common planning period.	While this district articulates the right of any student to enroll in any class, particularly at the high school level, scheduling and prerequisite requirements make it nearly impossible for a student to take a class outside of his or her primary "track." Thus, a student enrolled in a basic English course who was able to handle a general track science course would not find a science class available when he or she had a free period during the day. Student planning teams, consisting of general and special education teachers, plan and implement supports and modifications needed by students with IEPs. These teams meet three or four times per quarter and are concerned primarily with adaptations for individual students.

07/22/97 11:39 FAX 412 359 1601 ASRI CFS 013

Table 1(cont.).

GUIDING QUESTIONS	DISTRICT A	DISTRICT B
Does the district utilize instructional methods and materials that are responsive to the needs of a heterogeneous school population? Has the district established specific instructional priorities and goals for meeting the learning needs of each and every child? Does the district encourage teachers to utilize new strategies for accommodating diverse student learning needs in every classroom?	Within the job description of general education teachers are several statements that hold teachers responsible for using "instructional strategies that are effective for heterogeneous groups of learners." Each year the school conducts staff development activities related to instructional strategies such as cooperative learning. General and special education teachers attend staff development workshops together. There are no workshops only for general education teachers. Teachers' yearly evaluations often include a focus on improving their skills in addressing the learning needs of students with diverse learning styles. The district has an inclusion philosophy that states the district's belief in "educating all students, to the maximum extent possible, in regular education classes in students' home schools."	There is no mention of learning styles or heterogeneous grouping in the job descriptions of teachers in this district. The district maintains the full continuum of special education placements through its special education classes and out-of-district placements. While staff development workshops are held on topics relating to "special education" such as behavior managment and IEP development, members of the special education teaching staff host their own staff development day away from the school at the same time as general education teachers are attending "regular education" workshops in the district. The district's mission statement emphasizes "all students" but there is no specific mention of inclusion. At some grade levels individual teachers enthusiastically include students with disabilities in their classrooms, while at other levels students with disabilities are largely separate.

07/22/97 11:39 FAX 412 359 1601 ASRI_CFS 014

Table 2. Guiding questions and sample state (New Hampshire) responses regarding curriculum and students with disabilities.

GUIDING QUESTIONS	NEW HAMPSHIRE
Has the state adopted standards that are broad in scope and purpose? That is, do the standards encompass more than strictly academic outcomes as defined by the traditional disciplines?	The state has developed proficiency standards that specify what students will know and be able to do at the end of the 3rd, 6th, and 10th grades in the language arts and mathematics; and at the end of the 6th and 10th grades in social studies and science. The standards represent a variety of skills, concepts, and dispositions that go well beyond the traditional content knowledge in the disciplines. They not only allow, but require students to utilize multiple intelligences. They also specify that students will acquire sophisticated understandings, as evidenced by the use of words in the proficiency standards such as compare, hypothesize, demonstrate, construct, estimate, predict, edit, and initiate. Because these disciplines are the only content area for which standards have been written, issues of citizenship, vocational skills, character, and so forth are not addressed.
Are the performance standards appropriate for students with disabilities as well? If not, what changes need to be made by the state?	The standards are appropriate and attainable by most students with disabilities. The legislation that established the statewide assessment system and the accompanying curriculum frameworks was specific in targeting all New Hampshire school children. However, procedures exist for modifications for students with significant disabilities, including exclusion from testing. The development of other acceptable modifications would increase the assessment's relevance for students with significant disabilities.
Does the state provide a model curriculum, curriculum frameworks or examples of curriculum adaptations, based on the same standards, that could be used with students with significant disabilities?	Neither the curriculum standards nor the accompanying frameworks provide specific examples for students with significant disabilities. Rather, procedures exist for modification for students with disabilities.

07/22/97 11:40 FAX 412 359 1601 ASRI CFS 015

Cheryl M. Jorgensen, Ph.D. is an Associate Professor at the University of New Hampshire. She may be contacted at the Institute on Disability, University of New Hampshire, 312 Morrill Hall, Durham, NH 03824, (603) 862-4678, CHERYLJ@HOPPER.UNH.EDU.

Douglas Fisher, Ph.D. is a Project Coordinator for the Consortium on Inclusive Schooling Practices (CISP). He may be contacted San Diego State University Interwork Institute, 5850 Hardy Avenue #112, San Diego, CA 92182, (619) 594-2507, DFISHER@MAIL.SDSU.EDU.

Virginia Roach, Ed.D. is a Deputy Director of the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE). She may be contacted NASBE, 1012 Cameron Street, Alexandria, VA 22314, (703) 684-4000, VIRGINIA@NASBE.ORG.

CISP Publications and Resources

The ***CISP Issue Brief*** series is a collaborative publication of the Consortium on Inclusive Schooling Practices (CISP), a five-year project (86V-40007) supported by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education, under cooperative agreement with the Allegheny University of the Health Sciences (formerly Allegheny-Singer Research Institute). Principal partners with AUHS include the National Association of State Boards of Education, San Diego State University, and the University of Montana.

CISP produces a variety of ***Issue Briefs*** each year for education policy makers and practitioners interested in developing inclusive education systems and communities. A listing of existing and future ***Issue Briefs*** and other CISP products is available on CISP's World Wide Web Site (http://www.auhs.edu/CFSP) or in hard copy. For print material requests or other information about the CISP project, contact: Mark McNutt, Child & Family Studies Program, Allegheny University of the Health Sciences, One Allegheny Center Suite 501, Pittsburgh, PA 15212, (412) 359-1654, (412) 359-1601 (Fax), E-mail: mcnutt@pgh.auhs.edu.

Preparation of this document was supported by Cooperative Agreement (86V-40007) from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, to Allegheny University of the Health Sciences (formerly Allegheny-Singer Research Institute). The opinions expressed herein do not represent those of the U.S. Deparment of Education and no official endorsement should be inferred.